

**SURVEY OF OTHER STATES' PRACTICES FOR
OUTFITTERS AND GUIDED TURKEY AND WATERFOWL
HUNTING**

**CONDUCTED BY
IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME
IDAHO OUTFITTERS & GUIDES LICENSING BOARD**

2010

April 19, 2010

To: State Fish and Wildlife Directors

From: Cal Groen, Director

Re: Information on Outfitting and Guiding for Turkeys and Waterfowl

Idaho regulates the Outfitting Industry but with a couple minor examples, does not currently allow for commercial outfitted/guided turkey and waterfowl hunting. Requests for licenses to outfit for turkey and waterfowl hunting on private lands in particular become more common with have raised various administrative and legal concerns. For these reasons, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game and the Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board are engaged in a facilitated process involving representatives from sportsman groups, landowners and outfitters each with differing viewpoints to determine whether collaborative solutions can be found. To that end, we have been asked by this collaborative group to determine what information or experience other states might have with outfitted/guided turkey and waterfowl hunting.

You can help us by your agency answering the following questions. We will provide you a report back on the responses and the results of Idaho's efforts to find solutions.

- Does your state regulate commercial hunting i.e., outfitter/guides? If so, is outfitted/guided turkey and waterfowl hunting regulated?
- What affect has commercial outfitted and guided hunts for turkeys had on public participation in those activities in your state? How about for waterfowl?
- What percentage of the huntable lands for turkey in your state is public vs. private? How about for waterfowl?
- Is there competition between commercial outfitters/guides and non-outfitted/guided hunters for access to private land for turkeys? How about for waterfowl?
- What affect have non-commercial private hunt clubs or private hunting cooperatives had on public access to private lands for turkey hunting? How about for waterfowl?
- Does your agency reserve or regulate hunting sites for waterfowl or turkey on private lands that your agency controls or pay for access to?

A response by May 10th would be greatly appreciated.

Please email responses to virgil.moore@idfg.idaho.gov

If you have questions please call 208-334-3771.

Thank you for your assistance.

State Fish and Wildlife Agency Responses to Turkey and Waterfowl Hunting Survey.

Twenty-four states responded to our request for information-

20 states allow outfitting on public land and 23 states allow outfitting on private land (Minnesota prohibits turkey outfitting by state law, North Carolina did not specify whether or not outfitting is allowed)

How have outfitted and guided hunts affected turkey and waterfowl hunters in your state?

- Over half of the states indicated that turkey and waterfowl outfitting had minimal impacts to turkey and waterfowl hunters
- Four states (Arkansas, Colorado, Utah, Washington) indicated outfitting negatively affected waterfowl hunters
- Four states (California, Nebraska, Nevada, Texas) indicated outfitting had positive and negative affects to access for turkey and waterfowl hunting.

To what degree is there competition between outfitters and non-outfitted hunters for access to private land for turkeys? For waterfowl?

- 19 states did not perceive (or perceived as minimal) competition between outfitters and non-outfitted turkey hunters
- 18 states did not perceive (or perceived as minimal) competition between outfitters and non-outfitted waterfowl hunters

Does your agency reserve or regulate hunting sites for waterfowl or turkey on lands you control or pay for access to?

- 12 states reserve or regulate hunting sites for turkey hunting
- 19 states reserve or regulate hunting sites for waterfowl hunting

	Guiding allowed		Affect		<u>Comment</u>
	<u>public</u>	<u>private</u>	<u>waterfowl</u>	<u>turkey</u>	
Alabama	yes	yes	no	no	
Alaska	yes	yes	no	Na	No turkeys in Alaska
Arizona	yes	yes	no	no	
Arkansas	no	yes	yes	unk	Changed rules to prohibit guiding on public land
California	yes	yes	both	both	
Colorado	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Delaware	yes	yes	unk	unk	No guiding for turkeys, nothing preventing it
Florida	yes	yes	no	no	
Indiana	yes	yes	unk	unk	
Kentucky	yes	yes	no	no	
Minnesota	yes	yes	no	unk	Guiding for turkeys prohibited by law
Mississippi	yes	yes	no	no	
Nebraska	no	yes	both	both	
Nevada	yes	yes	both	both	
New Hampshire	yes	yes	no	no	
North Carolina	unk	unk	unk	unk	
Ohio	yes	yes	no	no	
South Carolina	no	yes	no	no	
South Dakota	yes	yes	no	no	
Texas	yes	yes	both	both	
Utah	yes	yes	yes	no	
Washington	yes	yes	yes	no	
Wisconsin	yes	yes	no	no	
Wyoming	yes	yes	no	no	

Competition for access

	turkey	waterfowl
Alabama	no	no
Alaska	no	no
Arizona	no	no
Arkansas	no	no
California	yes	yes
Colorado	yes	yes
Delaware	no	No
Florida	no	no
Indiana	no	no
Kentucky	no	no
Minnesota	na	no
Mississippi	no	no
Nebraska	yes	yes
Nevada	no	no
New Hampshire	no	no
North Carolina	na	na
Ohio	no	no
South Carolina	no	no
South Dakota	no	no
Texas	no	no
Utah	no	yes
Washington	no	yes
Wisconsin	no	no
Wyoming	no	no

State Managed Access

	turkey	waterfowl
Alabama	no	yes
Alaska	no	No
Arizona	no	no
Arkansas	yes	yes
California	yes	yes
Colorado	yes	yes
Delaware	no	yes
Florida	no	no
Indiana	na	na
Kentucky	no	yes
Minnesota	no	yes
Mississippi	yes	yes
Nebraska	no	no
Nevada	no	yes
New Hampshire	no	no
North Carolina	yes	yes
Ohio	yes	yes
South Carolina	yes	yes
South Dakota	no	yes
Texas	yes	yes
Utah	yes	yes
Washington	yes	yes
Wisconsin	no	yes
Wyoming	yes	yes

How have outfitted and guided hunts affected turkey and waterfowl hunters in your state?

Alabama- We have not received negative comments from the turkey or waterfowl hunters that guided or outfitted hunters have affected them.

Alaska-Alaska does not have quantitative information by which to answer this question.

Although Alaska requires that waterfowl guides register with the state on an annual basis and obtain a waterfowl guide license, we have no information on how many of them actually guide during a year or the number of clients they guide. Currently there are fewer than 200 individuals that register as potential waterfowl guides each year, but in most situations waterfowl hunting is secondary to big game guiding and not the primary purpose of the hunt.

We do maintain a list of registered waterfowl guides that we use as contact information in the event of in-season regulation changes and to provide some indication of the general interest in providing guide services for waterfowl hunters.

We are not aware of any significant conflict between guided and unguided waterfowl hunters. The number of true waterfowl guides is small and guiding often occurs through remote lodges that offer a variety of guided hunting services and most often these are away from areas often

frequented by unguided waterfowl hunters, whether those unguided waterfowl hunters are resident, non-resident, or subsistence hunter.

Arizona- So question 1 (How have outfitted and guided hunts affected turkey and waterfowl hunters in your state?) could best be answered by "minimally." Most guides do so for big game in Arizona, and while there is limited guiding for turkeys and waterfowl, those guided hunters must participate for the most part on the same land and areas that non-guided hunters participate. Turkey (which are big game in Arizona) hunting is regulated by lottery draw in most units (only those who are drawn may participate, excepting archers and juniors hunters), and all hunters tend to have access to similar areas. Waterfowl hunting is not extremely popular in Arizona, but I am unaware of any conflicts on that front.

In recent years, we have had some guides buying up access to fairly large private tracts of land for hunting of elk and pronghorn, a cost that they obviously pass along to their clients. Turkey and waterfowl hunting in Arizona thus far have not brought sufficient interest to cause these types of conflicts. Because access to public lands is challenging within some of our areas with Gould's turkey and the number of permits are very limited, the potential for these conflicts do exist.

Arkansas- Currently guiding is not allowed on public land. However, that has not always been the case and prior to the prohibition, in the case of waterfowl hunting, guiding greatly added to overcrowding issues on state-owned waterfowl areas. We really don't have a whole lot of information on turkey guiding. Both are permitted on private land with a guide license required.

California- Guides are required to be licensed through the Department and they affect turkey hunters by a) locking up lands that might have been available on a "ask" basis or a lease basis, and by b) providing a way for beginning or time-limited hunters to hunt; guided turkey hunts are probably more successful and are indeed valuable to a segment of the public.

Historically, waterfowl guiding at Tulelake and Lower Klamath NWRs created stress and competition for "regular" hunters as the guides had faster boats, and did a few things to out-compete regular hunters for spots. Similar to the turkey hunting situation, waterfowl guides in the Central Valley provide access, gear (decoys, trained dogs) to give a few hunters quality hunting experiences, especially for geese.

Colorado- In Colorado, the impact outfitted and guided turkey and waterfowl hunts have on other turkey and waterfowl hunters is varied and dependant on numerous factors, the most relevant of which is the amount of public land available for hunting. Those areas with abundant public land hunting generally reported that outfitting had a lesser impact on waterfowl and turkey hunting, while those areas with little to no public land hunting generally reported significant impacts on waterfowl hunting, and to a lesser extent turkey hunting. Colorado is an interesting case study, as public land is abundant in the western part of the state and very limited in the eastern part of the state (see Fig. 1). Impacts of outfitting in the eastern part of the state were reported to be more significant than those in the western part of the state, although some western areas with a high percentage of riverfront private property also reported a significant impact.

In Colorado, the most significant impact of outfitting is the leasing of private hunting grounds. As quality hunting parcels that were once available to the general public are leased by clubs and/or outfitters, they become unavailable or too costly for the average hunter, thus reducing the

amount of overall hunting opportunity. In addition, a common practice, especially among those who outfit goose hunting, is the leasing of large tracts of land and holding many fields in reserve. Those properties are often not hunted, resulting in less total hunting opportunity in that area. A natural result of the reduction in hunting opportunity on private land is that more hunters gravitate towards public land parcels, thereby increasing the pressure on available public hunting areas.

Other reported impacts included:

- Outfitters drawing birds away from non-outfitted land with larger more persistent decoy spreads
- Outfitters potentially affecting feeding areas through modified agricultural practices
- Outfitters consistently shooting and pressuring birds, which may drive them out of the area and make them unavailable to other, less persistent hunters

Delaware- only have about 12 guides in the state and they are not guiding for turkey at this time even though there is nothing preventing it.

Florida- Wild Turkey: When our public lands quota permits were transferable, there were multiple reports of turkey hunting guides monopolizing the application process to obtain hunts on high demand areas and then transfer the permit to the client at a cost for the service. This was reportedly decreasing chances of other hunters getting selected. Now that quota permits are non-transferable, this is no longer the case. We suspect outfitters and guides have contributed to a decreased availability of private lands to the general turkey hunter, at least in the Osceola subspecies range.

Waterfowl: Waterfowl guides are fairly limited in Florida (as compared to Arkansas, etc) except on a few areas like Lake Okeechobee in particular. We do not hear from constituents about this issue so assume the impacts are relatively minimal (at least on public areas).

Indiana- We have not had complaints about outfitters per se, but have many complaints about private land being leased, resulting in fewer acres being available to the individual hunter. We are sure that some of these acres are being leased by outfitters as opposed to groups of hunters, but are unsure how prevalent this is because outfitters are not licensed in Indiana.

Kentucky- In Kentucky, all commercial guides are required to apply for a commercial guide license from the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources (KDFWR). In 2009, the KDFWR granted 183 (172 resident and 11 nonresident) commercial guide licenses. With an estimated 90,000 spring turkey hunters and 26,000 adult waterfowl hunters in Kentucky, the small percentage of licensed commercial guides are having minimal, if any, impacts on turkey or waterfowl hunters.

Minnesota- There are no regulated turkey or waterfowl guides or outfitters in Minnesota. Turkey guiding for compensation is expressly forbidden in state statute. A few waterfowl guide/outfitters do work in the state, but they are few in number. Minnesota hunters tend to be pretty self-sufficient, plus "liberal" public water access laws have limited the number of guides who make a living hunting waterfowl.

Mississippi- Currently, Mississippi does not license or regulate guides nor outfitters.

Nebraska- The state of Nebraska does not currently regulate outfitting or guiding except that it is **not** allowed on public lands. Guides/Outfitters have leased lands and have limited the access or opportunities for private individuals, sometimes on areas where private individuals have

accessed or leased this land for a number of years. There have been some complaints of guiding on some public lands, which is illegal in Nebraska. Outfitters do bring in nonresident hunters, generating income for the state.

Nevada- There are only a few Master guides for turkey and waterfowl hunts, specifically geese, with the majority of the guiding activity taking place in the Mason Valley, Lahontan and Fallon areas. It appears that guiding activity for both has not adversely affected hunting opportunity for non-guided hunters. Non-guided hunters are either hunting public land, privately owned land which is opened to the public or on state wildlife management areas. It appears that there are not any problems associated with non-guided hunters competing with guides in drawing for waterfowl blinds on WMA's. Although problems with the drawing of blinds exist, problems are not a result of a guide activities. A positive result of guided hunts for turkey and waterfowl, particularly in the Mason Valley area, is that guides have leased private lands for hunting from landowners who would otherwise not allow hunting to the general public. Landowners would rather have one person or entity who is responsible for their hunter's activities than many hunters who may obtain access but are not responsible enough to pick up their trash when they leave. Even those property owners who don't want to lease hunting rights to a specific guide and would allow hunting for a trespass fee to any hunter, still seem to be more advantageous to mainly those hunters utilizing a guides service since local and non-guided hunters are usually not willing to pay trespass fees. With unlimited turkey tags being sold for the Mason Valley area coupled with the opportunity for good waterfowl hunting, particularly geese, guides have filled the niche for providing opportunity to hunt on private land for those, specifically non-resident and well-to-do resident hunters who are willing to pay approximately \$400 to hunt a turkey or \$200/day to hunt geese on property that would otherwise be left unhunted by the public.

New Hampshire- I am not aware of anyone currently guiding waterfowl, although that does not mean it is not happening. As to how guiding may have affected turkey & waterfowl hunting, I can't say we have noticed any impact.

North Carolina- Regarding the first two questions, we have no data nor speculation to offer.

Ohio- We do not license outfitters and guides in Ohio. No significant conflicts noted.

South Carolina- Outfitted and guided hunts are not a big program within South Carolina - where it occurs it is on private lands and the impact on hunters is not a significant issue.

South Dakota- Turkey: Statewide, there has been little impact on turkey hunting. There are a few select areas and counties where commercial turkey hunting occurs, however it is not at a level that has prohibited turkey hunting opportunities. Waterfowl: Statewide, there has been little impact on waterfowl hunting. South Dakota has plenty of public areas that provide quality waterfowl hunting thus eliminating most, if not all, competition.

Texas- It is likely that outfitting turkey and waterfowl hunts is beneficial in Texas, but Texas is a large state and there are plenty of opportunities for non-guided hunts on private property, whether it is owned or leased for hunting. Additionally, if someone wants to go on a goose or duck or turkey hunt, and they don't have the skill or equipment, they can go with someone that can guide them and teach them.

Utah- It is difficult to fully evaluate the impact of turkey and waterfowl guides and outfitters on hunters in Utah because unlike big game outfitters, they are not required to be licensed or

registered. We therefore do not know how many are operating in Utah, and how many clients are requesting their services.

We currently allow waterfowl and turkey guiding on our state operated Wildlife Management Area's, but guiding is not allowed on federally managed Migratory Bird Refuges.

We have received complaints from waterfowl hunters regarding guides on state operated Waterfowl Management Areas (WMA's). Our WMA's support over 40% of all waterfowl hunting statewide, and therefore are intensively used by the public. Complaints generally involve displacement of unguided hunters from key areas occupied by guides and their clients. We have not received similar complaints from turkey hunters, which may be related to the relative abundance of public areas open to turkey hunting.

The Utah Waterfowl Association is currently pursuing rule changes that will require current guiding and licensing rules to apply to waterfowl hunting, and also are seeking elimination of guiding on state managed WMA's. This is evidence of what appears to be growing intolerance of waterfowl guiding at least on intensively used public areas.

Washington- In general, this has not been a major issue for hunters in Washington, except for waterfowl hunting on state managed property. There are some concerns from hunters about outfitters and hunt clubs locking up some of the better waterfowl hunting areas, but not a lot. At this point, outfitters and hunt clubs have not been viewed as much of an issue for turkey hunting.

Wisconsin- The benefits to turkey and waterfowl hunters have probably been minimal because they constitute a very small amount of the hunting activity that takes place. Outfitted hunts for turkeys do create competition for access to private lands that put the more casual, recreational hunter at a disadvantage for access to hunting areas. Survey information shows that this problem is probably not significant yet as access to hunting areas for turkeys is rated as good.

Results

A total of 4,350 spring turkey hunter surveys were returned. After duplicates were removed, the resulting response rate was 43.4%. The proportion of respondents who applied with landowner preference for this spring's turkey hunt permit was 18.8% (Table 1, Question 1). Statewide, 41.0% of the respondents have 0-5 years of spring turkey hunting experience and 11.4% have 16+ years of experience (Table 1, Question 2).

Surveyed hunters were asked how difficult it was to find a place to hunt in the spring of 2007, and 87.6% of the respondents said it was 'very easy' or 'somewhat easy' (Table 1, Question 8). Spring turkey hunters were also asked to report the days on which they hunted. Hunting pressure was relatively constant with more pressure on Saturday as well as Friday (Table 1, Question 9). Hunters averaged 3.3 days a field perusing turkeys.

Most respondents (91.6%) hunted on private land or a combination of private and public lands (Table 1, Question 14). One-fifth (20.0%) responded to "other hunters kept me from hunting where I wanted to" with 'definitely yes,' or 'somewhat.' Similarly, 16.4% of respondents answered "there was too much competition from other hunters where I hunted" with 'definitely yes,' or 'somewhat.' However, only 12.0% of the respondents indicated that other hunters interfered with their chance to bag a bird (Table 1, Question 15).

The same is probably true for waterfowl hunting - no great benefit to most hunters. Outfitted hunts do create competition for access to private lands that put the more casual hunter at a disadvantage. Much of Wisconsin's waterfowl hunting activity takes place on public lands,

however. Access is not an issue that hunters have raised as a significant concern during surveys or through public input in our recently update waterfowl management plan.

Wyoming- Outfitted and guided hunts for turkey and waterfowl have a minimal effect on hunters. In some areas of Wyoming there has been an increase in outfitted and guided hunts for turkey, primarily in northeast Wyoming. This is in large part due to higher densities of turkeys in this portion of the state. Outfitters and guided hunts for waterfowl seem to concentrate in southeast Wyoming. Both with turkey and waterfowl outfitted/guided hunts, hunting access seem to be the most affected.

To what degree is there competition between outfitters and non-outfitted hunters for access to private land for turkeys? For waterfowl?

Alabama- Almost all hunting in Alabama is on private lands, much of which is under lease. Outfitters or commercial hunting operations present no more competition than non-guided hunts.

Alaska- Because of the size of Alaska and the land ownership patterns in the state there is not any reported competition for guiding on private land. The number of waterfowl hunters in Alaska is very low, particularly relative to the size of the state and competition between guided and non-guided hunters is not a management problem.

Arizona- Question 2 (competition for private land for guided hunts on turkey and waterfowl) has not posed much of a threat to date in Arizona. Virtually all turkey hunting is on public land, and access to public land for turkey and waterfowl hunting is probably the greatest potential for this to develop. To date, it has not been much of an issue, if at all. Again, waterfowl hunting in Arizona has a fairly limited following.

Arkansas- Almost all of the private land in Arkansas where waterfowl hunting occurs is either hunted by the landowner or leased to hunters. We really don't have outfitters per say; however, there are duck clubs that do charge by the day or by the person. Usually they have a lodge and provide room and board. Hunters can access private land with landowner permission for both turkey and waterfowl if the landowner is willing.

California- Private lands offer some of the best hunting opportunities for both turkeys and waterfowl in California and many of those lands are leased. Some level of competition exists which is mostly resolved through economic competition between guides and non-outfitted hunters with the landowner.

Colorado- Competition between outfitters and non-outfitted hunters is embodied largely in an indirect fashion through the competition for access to hunting areas. In high demand waterfowl areas, it is very difficult for the average hunter to obtain permission on private ground without leasing the land or hiring an outfitter. As described above, competition for access to private hunting leases is significant, and such leases often are possessed by outfitters. In some cases, outfitters tend to have existing leases for other species and landowners extend those leases for waterfowl and turkeys often at no additional cost due to existing relationships. In this way, some outfitters are able to leverage their previous expenditures and "lock up" private lands with turkey or waterfowl potential, even though in many cases the outfitter is not hunting these species. In addition, the competitive nature of some outfitters has reportedly led to territorial disputes, aggressive interactions with hunters, and, in extreme examples, reports of sabotage of others' fields (foiling and other techniques). The aggressive nature of some outfitters has reportedly discouraged some landowners from allowing people to hunt, with some who previously would lease hunting areas on a "per-day" basis discontinuing the practice all together. Reported conflicts were less significant for turkey. In Western Colorado, private land parcels tend to exist along the lowland river corridors with significant public land in the uplands. Therefore, while competition for hunting areas along river corridors might be relatively high, significant upland hunting opportunity minimizes the competition for turkey hunting areas. This is not the case for waterfowl hunting areas, which in Western Colorado are focused largely on the river corridors. Therefore, when quality private hunting areas exist, they often garner the interest of outfitters, and public opportunity is generally less available.

Delaware- With only about 12 guides, there does not appear to be any conflict.

Florida- Wild Turkey: With respect to private land, especially in the Osceola range, we have heard of landowners effecting separate leases for turkey to increase revenue (i.e., outside of the typical "deer" lease which enables the hunting of all legal species). They lease turkey hunting rights to outfitters or hunters or offer hunts themselves. Even outside of this, it is unlikely that a general hunter would have access to these lands so not sure if it is taking away from the average hunter. Could argue that it increases the lease fees and thus makes it less available.

Waterfowl: We are not aware of incidents involving competition for waterfowl leases between guides and hunters here in Florida. This may be due in part to the availability of public areas open to hunters. Waterfowl leases seem to be increasing in price (based on a few lease holders we know), but these properties are already priced above the average citizen's ability to pay. Many of these are "corporate" type leases/subleases. One possible impact of guides are increased lease costs for private duck ponds.

Indiana- see above

Kentucky- In Kentucky, approximately 93% of all land holdings are private. As a result, any competition between outfitted and non-outfitted hunters would most likely occur on private land. Based on the proportionally low number of licensed outfitters and minimal public comment regarding competition for hunting space, however, it appears this is not a significant issue in Kentucky.

Minnesota- None for turkeys (see above), and very little (but not unheard of) from waterfowl outfitters.

Mississippi- Very little competition because over 90% of Mississippi is privately owned.

Nebraska- Competition between outfitters and non-outfitted hunters is likely to increase. There haven't been significant complaints concerning turkey or waterfowl hunting, but rather access to areas that have been leased by outfitters, thus limiting public access to waterfowl hunting.

Nevada- Competition between guides and non-guided hunters for access to private land to hunt turkey and waterfowl is very minimal. You either have hunters that are willing to pay the trespass fee or they aren't. Unfortunately those that are not using a guides service are the same hunters that are often not willing to pay what they often consider outrageous trespass fees to hunt private land. Sometimes the property owner is not willing to allow individual hunters to trespass, and only do so on a case by case basis because they want to lease the sole rights out for a larger fee to one individual who they can hold responsible for problems. With Nevada being mostly public land (87%) there still seems to be way more competition and complaints from non-guided big game hunters relative to gaining access through private lands in order to hunt public lands for big game animals (primarily in Elko, Humboldt and Washoe counties) than what we encounter for turkey and waterfowl.

New Hampshire- There is little competition here between guided and non guided hunters as public land is open to all the public and all private land **unless posted** is available to the public also. Most large landowners are in our current use program which gives them significant property tax breaks for keeping land in agriculture or forest and a requirement for maximum benefit is that the land is open for the public. I know this is a very different system than the western states and is a legacy of our fore father's rejection of the English Nobility's exclusive

ownership of wild game. Here, while you own the land (and the plants and trees), wildlife is a public resource.

North Carolina -Regarding the first two questions, we have no data nor speculation to offer.

Ohio- Leasing for deer hunting is becoming a big deal in parts of Ohio where 95% of the state is in private ownership. This practice limits some opportunity for turkey hunting as well; however, guiding / outfitting is not really a big business here and does not result in significant conflicts between hunter groups. Waterfowl hunting is concentrated in the Lake Erie / Sandusky Bay region and private clubs tend to dominate the best spots but again outfitters aren't the issue.

South Carolina- This does not seem to be a significant issue as hunters generally do not have access to private land unless they know the landowner or are parties to hunting leases. For waterfowl? Same as for turkey

South Dakota- Turkey: There is little competition for access to private land between commercial and non-commercial. There are a few areas where there is a higher level of commercial turkey hunting; however on a statewide basis the impact is minimal. Waterfowl: There is little competition for access to private land. The South Dakota legislature has limited the number of non-resident waterfowl hunters which reduces, and has virtually eliminated, any competition for private land access. There are also ample opportunities to waterfowl hunt on public land, which also reduces the competition on private land.

Texas- There is probably not much competition for turkey because they (Rio Grande subspecies) are widespread in Texas. There may be some competition to lease private land on the Gulf Coast for duck, goose and dove hunting privileges, but we haven't heard much complaining. Of course, hunters are accustomed to paying for the privilege to access private land to hunt in Texas, even with a guide or outfitter.

Utah- We are not aware of any current competition between outfitters and turkey hunters on private land, but turkey hunting is becoming more popular and future conflicts could occur. Regarding waterfowl, there is a long history of competition for access to private lands. In fact the acquisition and development of State owned WMA's was largely driven by the incorporation of the best waterfowl hunting areas into organized private hunting clubs around the turn of the 19th century. The state actions were reactionary to private development as a means to protect for public use areas of high waterfowl abundance and value. Today, essentially all private land that offers good waterfowl hunting opportunity is incorporated into hunting clubs or annual leases. Agricultural areas that offer good goose hunting are extreme examples of that competition. We are aware of 1/4 sections of cropland that are leasing for as much as \$30,000 annually for the waterfowl hunting rights. We are also aware of situations where access to public areas has been purchased by outfitters as a means to eliminate or minimize the competing public on or near private hunting areas.

Washington- As mentioned under number 1 above, competition for turkey hunting access has not been much of an issue to date. With waterfowl hunting it is more of an issue and WDFW actively pursues access for waterfowl hunting and habitat enhancement through our private lands access program. Most of this is funded by our state migratory bird permit and federal (PR) funds. I think we are pretty competitive, but are often out bid for some of the very best sites.

Wisconsin- Access to private land - covered already under 1. While there is competition, it does not seem to be such a great concern that hunters are telling us about it in surveys. The answer to this question would be very different if deer or bear were being addressed.

Wyoming- The degree of competition between outfitted turkey hunts and non-outfitted turkey hunts could be classified as minimal for most of the state. However, in some areas there is moderate competition for access to private lands. This is usually with outfitters leasing large areas for their hunting clients.

The degree of competition between outfitted waterfowl hunts and non-outfitted waterfowl hunts could be classified as minimal. We have some isolated areas in southeastern Wyoming where a few outfitters are hunting waterfowl, primarily geese. Southeastern Wyoming is primarily private land, where most waterfowl hunting is done on leases, not necessarily leased by outfitters but rather by groups of hunters.

Does your agency reserve or regulate hunting sites for waterfowl or turkey on lands you control or pay for access to?

Alabama- We have 50 waterfowl blind sites that are offered by drawing on an annual basis.

Alaska- No.

Arizona- When we regulate access, we routinely regulate number of hunters. Should a hunter choose to hire a guide, they are part of the "hunter" and we do not regularly limit the activity. That said, I am unaware of anywhere where this has been an issue.

Arkansas- Yes we do, for waterfowl, hunting areas are open to the public for morning hunting only in a first come basis. A couple areas require an application/draw system for permits. The same goes for turkey hunting. Some areas are wide open and some require a permit.

California- CDFG regulates access by permit to certain high-demand Department-owned Wildlife Areas and some Federal Wildlife Refuges for turkeys and waterfowl. No distinction is made between guides and the general hunting public when applying for or issuing these permits. However, we do not think that there is much competition between guides and hunters on these particular public lands that are open to no-fee permits through public drawing.

Colorado- While Division of Wildlife properties are largely available for hunting by the public at large, access to a small percentage of those properties is controlled by a reservation system. In most cases, this system is in place to regulate demand and ensure a high-quality hunting experience for high-demand waterfowl hunting areas. In other cases, regulations control access to ensure a quality experience for youth hunters. Properties controlled by the Division and regulated by a reservation system are fewer than 30 in number statewide, or approximately seven percent of more than 400 properties controlled by the Division.

Delaware- Yes. On some of our state areas, we have reserved goose hunts using a lottery system. On some areas we have a daily lottery for duck blinds. For turkey hunting, we have a pre-season lottery for the limited number of permits we have available.

Florida- While we control access to public lands for turkey and waterfowl hunting through seasons, quota permits, etc., we do not regulate or differentiate between guides/outfitters/general hunter's access to or use of these lands.

Indiana- Yes, and on state-owned that was purchased or is managed with federal funds, outfitting/guiding is expressly forbidden.

Kentucky- The KDFWR does not reserve or regulate hunting sites for turkey on lands owned or managed by the Department. The only exemption to this would be on federally owned or operated military installations in which limited turkey hunting opportunities are offered to civilians. Those sites include Fort Knox, Fort Campbell, and the Bluegrass Army Depot where limited hunter access is controlled by the Department of Defense.

We do regulate some waterfowl hunting areas. These areas are limited to hunters selected by a pre-season blind draw. Some are day hunts only while others are for the season. All but one are open to the general public on a first-come, first-serve basis. The one that is not has a daily standby draw for remaining open slots that specific day.

Minnesota- Generally no, although we still do have a few "controlled" goose hunts where hunters need to reserve a specific blind. These have become much less popular in the last decade as our statewide resident goose population has grown. The number of blinds has diminished significantly, and we are down to 3 sites. I will say that we are now exploring the idea of having some controlled duck hunts on public land in order to improve the "quality" of the hunts, but these will likely be limited in number. We also have a few "special" turkey hunts for kids or persons with disabilities where we regulate hunting opportunity.

Mississippi- Yes, the MDWFP has select draw hunts for waterfowl and/or turkey hunts on approximately 30% of the state wildlife management areas.

Nebraska- The state of Nebraska does not reserve hunting sites for turkey or waterfowl, except on a few places designated for youth hunting.

Nevada- The Nevada Department of Wildlife is responsible for several Wildlife Management Areas that emphasize waterfowl as a high priority and provide hunting opportunities for waterfowl. Some of these properties also provide turkey hunting opportunities. Only two of them currently have any sort of a "reservation" system. The Overton Wildlife Management Area on the edge of Lake Mead has a reservation system for specific duck/goose blinds and is open every other day during the open waterfowl season. The Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area has a special goose season in November with a reservation system for 8 blinds located in fields while the rest of the management area remains open. Conflicts between turkey hunting and waterfowl hunting is generally taken care of by coordinating timing of open seasons for turkeys.

New Hampshire- We do not reserve or regulate hunting sites, although I know this is common practice in many states with large waterfowl resources.

North Carolina- Yes - both waterfowl and turkey hunting on some state game lands is regulated through a permit hunt system. Some game lands are further compartmentalized and permits apply on to specific areas within a game land. However, the intent of restricting opportunity through limited permit hunts is not specifically to reduce competition between outfitters and non-outfitted hunters. Our primary intent is to reduce competition between hunters in general (to include outfitted vs non-outfitted), provide quality hunting experiences, provide a level of protection to the resource where necessary, and particularly with waterfowl, to spread the hunting pressure over a greater period of time.

We have experienced competition between waterfowl outfitters and non-outfitted waterfowl hunters on some game lands. Specifically, we had a large outfitter that was building permanent waterfowl blinds on a major game land reservoir, placing very large decoy spreads at each blind location the afternoon prior to each legal hunting day, and subsequently insisting that these locations were not available to hunters other than his customers. We resolved this specific issue by enacting a rule to prohibit the use or construction of permanent hunting blinds at that location. For the purpose of our rule, "Permanent Hunting Blind" is defined as any structure used for hunter concealment, constructed from man made or natural materials, that is not disassembled and removed at the end of each day's hunt.

One other applicable rule that we use to manage competition on game lands prohibits entry and placement of decoys in managed waterfowl impoundments prior to 4:00 a.m. on the permitted hunting dates, and requires removal of decoys immediately after each days hunt.

On game lands where blinds are not specifically prohibited, they may be constructed and used; however, they become public property and are available to anyone on a first-come, first-served basis."

Ohio- We do for controlled hunts for waterfowl at selected sites with high public demand and for a few areas with youth turkey hunting opportunities.

South Carolina- We have hunting programs where we have a public draw for hunts on many public lands managed by SCDNR.

South Dakota- Turkey: The state does not reserve or regulate hunting sites for turkey on lands we own or pay for access. **Waterfowl:** The Lower Oahe Waterfowl Access Hunting Program includes approximately 35,000 acres from nine cooperating landowners in the Pierre area. These lands are leased primarily to provide waterfowl hunting opportunities, however much of the land is also utilized by upland game and big game hunters. There are 43 decoy-only registration fields and 74 pits available for pass-shooting hunts.

Texas:- Yes. We have a Public Hunting Program and depending on the area and the species hunted, access to "reserved sites" can be by drawing, or on a first come first served basis.

Utah- As mentioned above, Utah owns and operates 24 Waterfowl Management Areas that receive over 40% of the statewide waterfowl hunting effort. We do not charge for the use of these areas and do not restrict the number of hunters that use them or the days they are open. We currently allow guiding on these areas.

Utah also has a Cooperative Wildlife Management Unit (CWMU) program that allows landowner(s) that meet minimum landownership requirements to apply for and administer a number of permits. While there is no access fee charged to hunters, nor does DWR pay for fees nor receive additional fees relating to the CWMU permits or programs, they may fall under the realm and intent of this question. Basically, a landowner can enroll as a sanctioned CWMU operator with DWR. He then can request a certain number of turkey permits which is coordinated and sanctioned by DWR as well. The permits are divided equally to the landowner (50 : 50 split) as private and public permits and the landowner can sell his share of the permits to anyone he desires. The other permits go into a drawing and are available through the drawing to the public at no extra charge. All permits are held and sold by the DWR. So, the program is not a "guide and outfitter" system, but it may fit in the realm of the question in that it both limits public access to private lands in the CWMU as a whole but also provides public access to private land within the CWMU in a limited fashion. Utah currently has 5 enrolled CWMU's for wild turkey hunting.

Utah also has a Walk-in Access Program for hunting, fishing and trapping that pays landowners to allow public access to their properties. Some of these areas provide turkey and waterfowl hunting opportunity.

Washington-Yes, we do regulate hunting sites for quality hunting areas. We also require permits for waterfowl hunting guides on public property and have rules designed to even the playing field in the competition for popular sites such as: timing restrictions for placing decoys and first come first served on established blinds. We also have plans to develop a comprehensive reservation system over the next couple of years to expand the availability of quality hunting opportunity, especially for upland game and waterfowl hunting.

Wisconsin- Wisconsin will be experimenting with limiting the number of waterfowl hunters on one public property in the near future. We have done this on a limited basis for goose hunters on a handful of popular properties as well but, since the recovery of locally nesting Canada geese, we have tended away from this type of goose hunter management and there has been less demand for it. Turkey hunter numbers are limited by permit statewide which reduces the need to limit numbers on individual properties. Hunter numbers are limited by permit at a handful of state park properties (primarily to reduce conflict with other property users) but not at public hunting areas in general.

Wyoming- The Department has lands which are owned by the commission and lands which are leased through our Private Land Public Wildlife (PLPW) program. Our PLPW program consists of private lands that are leased for hunting and fishing access through Walk-in areas (WIA) and Hunter Management Areas (HMA). WIA and HMA contracts are created between the landowners and the Department and specific regulations about the property are drafted. These regulations usually outline how many hunters will be given access, which roads will be open to vehicular travel, and other concerns about the property. The PLPW program has property enrolled for both turkey and waterfowl hunting.

There are only a few Department owned properties where specific sites are reserved for hunting. The Bump-Sullivan hunt is a hunt where blinds are located around the Bump-Sullivan reservoir. These blinds are assigned to waterfowl hunters through a random draw for hunters wishing to hunt the Bump-Sullivan reservoir. This helps avoid overcrowding and safety concerns on the property. In recent years, the Bump-Sullivan hunt has not taken place due to lack of water in the reservoir.

On all Department owned lands and lands leased by the Department, the Commission adopts regulations pertaining to each property, but only a few properties regulate specific hunting sites.